

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 30, 2008. Claim 8 is amended and claims 7-18 remain pending in view of the above amendments. Applicant notes that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. Applicant also notes that the remarks presented herein have been made merely to clarify the claimed embodiments from elements purported by the Examiner to be taught by the cited reference. Such remarks, or a lack of remarks, are not intended to constitute, and should not be construed as, an acquiescence, on the part of the Applicant: as to the purported teachings or prior art status of the cited references; as to the characterization of the cited references advanced by the Examiner; or as to any other assertions, allegations or characterizations made by the Examiner at any time in this case. Applicant reserves the right to challenge the purported teaching and prior art status of the cited references at any appropriate time. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0110803 (*Saito*). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least on the grounds that the cited reference fails to teach each and every element of the rejected claims, as the elements are arranged in the claim.

In rejecting claim 7, the Office Action cites Figure 1 and ¶¶[0076],[0078] of *Saito*. The Office action states ". . . wherein the altered surface layer formed by acidic washing in the first washing step is removed by the step for grinding and the second washing step" (see Fig. 1, and Paragraph 0076); and scrubbing the glass plate while using diamond abrasion grains (Paragraph 0078).

Paragraph 0076 of *Saito*, however, describes a chemical strengthening step P6. Paragraph 0076 of *Saito* further describes that the chemical strengthening step P6 is carried out by immersing the glass substrate member for several hours in a mixed salt of potassium nitrate and sodium nitrate that has been melted by heating to a temperature of about 400 degree C.

Needless to say, the melted mixed salt of potassium nitrate and sodium nitrate is not acidic. Thus, the chemical strengthening step P6 of *Saito* does not teach or suggest "a first washing step for washing a surface of a disk-shaped glass plate with **an acid washing liquid**, wherein an altered surface layer is formed on the surface of the glass substrate by the first washing step" as recited in claim 7. Thus, immersing the glass substrate in a mixed salt fails to teach or suggest washing a surface of a disk-shaped glass plate with an acid washing liquid.

Paragraph 0078 of *Saito* describes a texturing step P7 for forming circular texture lines on the chemical strengthened glass substrate member. In the texturing step P7, the chemical strengthened layer of the chemical strengthened glass substrate member is partially removed to form the circular texture lines. As discussed above, however, the chemical strengthening step P6 of *Saito* is distinct from the "a first washing step" of claim 7. The chemical strengthened layer formed by the chemical strengthening step P6 is therefore distinct from "the altered surface layer **formed by acidic washing in the first washing step**" as recited in claim 7.

For at least the reasons above, claim 7 is not anticipated by *Saito*. Claim 9 is patentable for at least the same reasons.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saito* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0109202 (*Matsuno*).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least on the grounds that the cited art fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claim.

Claim 10 is allowable because it depends on allowable claim 7 as mentioned above. In addition, there is another reason that claim 10 is patentable over *Saito* in

view of *Matsuno*. The Office Action states that "*Matsuno* discloses ... immersing the glass plate in a strong acid solution and then" However, it is well known in the art that a glass substrate can not be chemical strengthened by the strong acid solution as disclosed in *Matsuno*. Therefore, one skilled in the art will not employ the immersing step of *Matsuno* in the chemical strengthening step P6 of *Saito*. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over the cited art.

Allowed Subject Matter

The Office action objected to claim 8 as being dependent on a rejected base claim and indicated that claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form and is therefore in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner.

The Examiner's careful review and allowance of claims 11-18 is appreciated. The Applicants submit the following comments concerning the Examiner's statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claimed invention of claims 10-18 is patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiners statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicants do not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated September 30, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl T. Reed/ Reg. # 45454
CARL T. REED

Registration No. 45,454
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone No. 801.533.9800

2120740_1